

**Remarks****Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been rewritten so as to seek to ensure that all of the distinguishing features of the claim are given patentable weight and to clarify the distinctions over the cited art.

Accordingly the feature “indicative of whether or not the last received macroblock was encoded in inter-frame prediction format” should now be given patentable weight. The body of the claim involves use of a (received) mode indicator signal for comparison with the indication from a first comparator.

The passage “the decoder is operative to receive said encoded video signals transmitted through air and selectively in inter-frame prediction format wherein the signals represent differences between selected macroblocks in successive frames when a specific difference criterion between said successive macroblocks is not exceeded, the decoder also being operative to provide a mode indicator signal indicative of whether or not the last received macroblock was encoded in said inter-frame prediction format, frames comprising macroblocks;” should also be given patentable weight. The body of the claim involves use at the receiver of the mode indicator signal.

**35 USC 102(b) Rejections**

Claim 1 distinguishes over Urano. According to the present invention, the received video signals are transmitted through air. The received video signals provide the mode indicator signal. It is this decoded mode indicator signal, indicative of whether or not inter-frame prediction format was applied, that is compared in the receiver to the output from a first comparator that compares macroblocks in successive frames to produce an indication of whether inter-frame prediction format should apply or not. This is clear in amended claim 1. The first comparator can be considered as doing a “fresh” comparison of appropriate macroblocks to see whether interframe production format should have been applied or not and the result of that is compared to the mode indicator

signal. The present invention thus provides a useful means of error detection at the receiver.

This clearly distinguishes over Urano which relates to processing at an encoder to produce macroblock information MBT for transmission (emphasis added).

The present invention according to amended claim 1 relates to a receiver whereas the cited portions of Urano relate to transmitters. Specifically, as mentioned in Urano column 3, line 40, Figure 8 shows an encoder, parts of which are described in column 9, lines 21 to 35 and in column 9, lines 50 to 53 in relation to Figure 12, see column 9, lines 37 to 39. Furthermore, column 14, lines 57 to 60, which relate to Figures 17 and 21, see column 12, lines 51 to 52 and column 3, lines 59 to 65, also relates to an encoder.

Also, in Urano dispersion value comparator 232 in Figure 12 appears to compare outputs from four different dispersion value calculators 216, 226, 228, 230 so as to choose between three different types of inter-frame prediction compression or none during encoding, see column 10 line 52 to column 11 line 2.

In his response to arguments, the Examiner has cited further portions of Urano, namely column 19 lines 5 to 49 and Figure 31. These are not more relevant than the previously cited portions of Urano. Specifically, as mentioned on column 16 lines 66 to 67, Figure 29 shows an encoder, parts of which are described in column 19 lines 5 to 49 and shown in Figure 31. Also, dispersion value comparator 454 in Figure 31 appears to compare outputs from multiple different dispersion calculators, such as 440, 445, 446 and 452, so as to choose between different types of inter-frame prediction compression or none during encoding, see column 19 lines 3 to 17 and column 19 lines 50 to column 20 line 16.

As previously outlined, the present invention concerns operations at a receiver, more specifically comparison of corresponding macroblocks of current and previous frames to determine whether interframe-prediction format was applied or not, and comparison of the result with a received mode indicator signal in order to detect errors.

For completeness, we should mention that the passage of Urano cited in column 14, lines 57 to 60 does not teach comparison of that result with a received mode indicator


signal indicative of whether or not inter-frame prediction was applied in compression before transmission. Also, column 14 lines 57 to 60 relates to a different system to that shown in Figure 12.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 were indicated as being rejected under 35 USC 102. However, no reasoning was provided as to how the extra features referred to in those dependent claims were disclosed by Urano. Nevertheless, this is believed to now be moot, as these claims 2, 3 and 5 now depend on what is believed to be an allowable amended base claim, and so are allowable not least on that basis.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance. In the event of any fees inadvertently omitted or any improper payment of fees, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No.12-2325 to correct the error now or during the pendency of this application.

If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone conversation would be helpful, please contact Martin Finston at 973 386 3147.

Respectfully submitted,  
Faruk Mehmet Eryurtlu

By: 

**Martin I. Finston**  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Reg. No. 31613  
(973)-386-3147

Date: February 27, 2006

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)  
Lucent Technologies Inc.  
101 Crawfords Corner Road  
Holmdel, New Jersey 07733-3030